

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendment and the arguments presented herein. Claims 1 and 3-25 are pending. Claims 1 and 3-25 stand rejected. Claim 26 has been added. Claim 2 has been cancelled in order to maintain the same number of claims. Independent Claims 1, 10, 12, 15 and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been added. For example, support for the amendments to the independent Claims 1, 10, 12, 15 and 17 can be found in the instant Application as filed at paragraphs 0031, 0033, 0035, 0076, 0077, and 0094, among other places. Support for new Claim 26 can be found in the instant Application as filed at paragraphs 0050 and 0056, among other places.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Office Action has a section titled Claim objects. However, the claims are correctly numbered.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application 6,125,447 by Gong (referred to hereinafter as "Gong"). Applicant respectfully submits that Gong does not describe or teach the embodiments recited by Claims 1, and 3-25 of the instant Application for at least the following rationale.

MPEP §2131 provides:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

Applicant understands Gong to require his code to be instances of object oriented (OO) classes so that Gong can easily map Gong's protection domain, which represent Gong's protection attributes, to the OO classes (abstract; Col. 2 line 66-Col. 3 line 1; Col. 6 lines 44-45; Col. 6 lines 55-62; Col. 8 lines 39-43; Col. 10 lines 52-53; Col. 12 lines 39-47). By mapping OO classes to protection domains, Applicant understands Gong to achieve Gong's intended purpose of reducing the effort and in-depth knowledge required to modify permissions or to create new permissions to provide security for the code (e.g., the instances of the OO classes) that, for example, may be loaded from remote resources over a network (Col. 2 lines 44-50; Col. 1 lines 60-62). Therefore, Applicant understands Gong to require his code to be instances of OO classes.

In contrast, Claim 1 recites "wherein said portions of code are not required to be associated with one or more object oriented classes." Applicant respectfully submits that requiring code to be instances of OO classes, as Gong teaches, does not describe or teach "wherein said portions of code are not required to be associated with one or more object oriented classes," as recited by Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Gong.

For similar reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 10, 12, 15 and 17 are patentable over Gong in that independent Claims 10, 12, 15 and 17 also recite "wherein said portions of code are not required to be associated with one or more object oriented classes."

Claims 3-9 depend on independent Claim 10. Claim 11 depends on independent Claim 10. Claims 13 and 14 depend on independent Claim 12. Claim 16 depends on independent Claim 15. Claims 18-25 depend on independent Claim 17. These dependent claims include all of the features of their respective independent base claims. Therefore, these dependent claims should be patentable for at least the reasons that their respective independent claims should be patentable.

Further, these dependent claims recite additional features which further distinguish them over Gong. For example, new Claim 26 recites “wherein said second portion of code is allowed to access said first portion of code after a third portion of code accesses said second portion of code and wherein said third portion of code is not required to allow access to said first portion of code.” In contrast, Gong teaches at Col. 12 lines 30-35 that “[a] requested action is authorized if every protection domain associated with the objects represented by the call stack when the request for the requested action was made contains a permission authorizing the permission required to perform the requested action” (emphasis added). In Gong’s model, second portion of code may or may not allow access to first portion of code depending on the call stack before getting to the second portion of the code; which makes application code behavior non-deterministic. In contrast, “wherein said second portion of code is allowed to access said first portion of code after a third portion of code accesses said second portion of code and wherein said third portion of code is not required to allow access to said first portion of code,” as recited, exhibits deterministic behavior. Applicant respectfully submits that requiring authorization to perform a requested action from every protection domain associated with the objects currently represented by the call stack, as taught by Gong at Col. 12 lines 30-35, does not describe or teach “wherein said second portion of code is allowed to access said first portion of code after a third portion of code accesses said second portion of code and wherein said third portion of code is not required to allow said second portion of code to access said first portion of code,” as recited by new Claim 26. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 26 recites additional features, which further distinguishes Claim 26 over Gong.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 3-25 overcome the rejections of record. For reasons discussed herein, Applicant respectfully requests that Claims 1 and 3-25 be considered by the Examiner. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1 and 3-25 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: 01/12/2011

/Matthew J. Blecher/

Matthew J. Blecher
Registration No. 46,558

Address: Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, California 95076 USA

Telephone: (408) 377-0500 Voice
(408) 234-3649 Direct/Cell
(831) 722-2350 Facsimile